

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14 and 15 are all the claims pending in the application.

Objection to Drawings:

With respect to the drawings, the Examiner states that the three mode limitation must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to Figure 2, which shows the three modes, as well as the three-modes description in the specification starting at page 11, line 15. Additionally, Figures 9-11 show the three modes individually.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections:

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, stating that the limitations of “wherein the printer includes at least three modes” was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Specifically, these modes are discussed throughout the specification when discussing Figures 2, and 9-11,

Claims 1, 2, and 4-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that it is unclear the “plural memory blocks” of the last line in claim 1 (and 12) is referring to the plural memory blocks of the second buffer memory or the plural memory blocks of the first memory or the memory blocks of both the first buffer memory and the second buffer memory. To more clearly define this feature, Applicants have amended

claims 1 and 12 to indicate that the plural memory blocks are included in both the first and second buffer memories.

The Examiner also states that the limitation “via said auxiliary storage”, according to an ordinary person, has the meaning of going through only the auxiliary storage. However, from the structure of the claims, the Examiner states that it appears that the feature “via said auxiliary storage” is intended to mean something different-going through some buffer memories and the auxiliary storage. Further, the Examiner states that it is unclear the exact path of the data received of the first bypass mode and the second bypass mode, stating that Applicant is required to particularly point out and distinctly claim the path of the received data of the first bypass mode and the second bypass mode.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In particular, Applicants know of no requirement that states that the claims cannot be as broad as they are currently written, or that would require an “exact” path of the data. For example, the claims could include exemplary embodiments where the received data is input to the image data generation means directly through the auxiliary storage, or through intermediate steps prior to the being input through the auxiliary storage. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is improper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103:

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bender in view of Yonei. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonei in view of Bender in further view of Heart. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In particular, these claims recite the difference among *three modes* based on the transfer of the memory blocks, which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, as

argued in prior Responses. Further, Yonei's "bypass mode" is not the same as the recited second bypass mode.

The Examiner states on page 14 of the Office Action that due to the confusion of the claimed limitations in claims 1, 2, and 4-12 that he cannot reasonably interpret or apply a prior art rejection. In view of the three modes being explicitly disclosed in the present application, as well as based on the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the application, or issue a non-final Office Action to discuss how the three-mode feature is disclosed by the prior art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Kimble
Registration No. 44,186